

54353

PARSONS ENGINEERING SCIENCE, INC.
1700 Broadway, Suite 900 Denver, Colorado 80290
phone: (303) 831-8100 • telecopy (303) 831-8208

MEETING MINUTES

TO: Distribution **DATE:** May 1, 1995
FROM: Phil Nixon *PN* **DOCUMENT #:** SP307:050295:01
PROJECT: OU4 IM/IRA
SUBJECT: IM/IRA Estimate to Complete

ATTENDANCE:

Andy Ledford, EG&G
Erica Atchinson, EG&G
Tina Meins, EG&G
Gabriele Greene, EG&G
Mike Bretz, EG&G
Alan Putinsky
Phil Nixon

DISTRIBUTION:

M. Matthews, EG&G,(2)
Pete Holland
Rick Wilkinson
Central Files (9.1.5.3)

Andy Ledford stated that the objective of the meeting was to discuss how much additional funding was required to complete the IM/IRA and to understand the reason why there were overruns with respect to the budget negotiated in December.

Erica Atchinson asked Parsons ES to move 50% of the total proposal costs to the IM/IRA Project Management WBS and 50% to the Design Project Management WBS.

Gabriele Greene requested to be put on the distribution list for the monthly earned value summary report.

Erica Atchinson and Mike Bretz indicated that the Parsons ES and EG&G baselines did not align. It was agreed that Parsons ES would go back to how the old hours were rebaselined and work with EG&G to align the allocation of hours/budget to the new WBS elements. Gabriele Greene requested that the new baseline align with the Accrual Report. Erica Atchinson indicated that the accrual report may require modification to align to the baseline.

Once the rebaseline effort is complete, then Parsons ES will prepare a proposal for the total estimate to complete the IM/IRA task.

It was discussed that approximately \$200,000 was an approximate requirement to complete the project as it is currently baseline. It was discussed that approximately \$50,000 was attributable to ODCs associated with copying and distribution. Approximately \$45,000 was needed to complete the responsiveness summary and the IM/IRA-EA Decision Document. The remaining budget was generally attributable to Project Management and the Technical/Regulatory Support WBS for emergent issues.

Andy Ledford indicated that since there was no new work in the scope of this proposal then Parsons ES should not charge EG&G for proposal preparation costs. Phil Nixon agreed that Parsons ES would not charge EG&G for this proposal.

Andy Ledford indicated that there were clearly areas where Parsons ES performed additional unplanned work which has resulted in cost overruns. Additional budget is needed to compensate for this work. However, EG&G does not consider that they should re-imburse Parsons ES for any inefficiencies or mistakes that Parsons ES has experienced during the performance of the project.

Andy Ledford asked if the project reporting was billable to the project under the MTS contract. Phil Nixon stated that project specific report such as the weekly status report and monthly earned value report were clearly billable because they are specifically requested by EG&G on a task specific basis. Phil Nixon will investigate whether the monthly status report and accrual report is billable because these reports are required by the MTS contract.

Andy Ledford stated that EG&G may prefer a fixed-price contract with Parsons ES. Phil Nixon responded that Parsons ES would consider a fixed price contractual arrangement, but indicated that this would require a very precise definition of the scope of work.